

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 were presented and examined. In response to the Office Action, Claims 1 and 3 are amended, no claims are cancelled and no claims are added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending Claims 1-6 in view of at least the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,689,431 to Rudow ("Rudow") in view of U.S. Patent 5,477,228 to Tiwari ("Tiwari"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

While Applicant's argument here is directed to the cited combination of references, it is necessary to first consider their individual teachings, in order to ascertain what combination (if any) could be made from them.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Claim 1 is amended to recite converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 data through the DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver. Claim 3 is amended to recite similar features.

Regarding Rudow, Rudow relates to a golf course yardage and information system where the golf yardage and information system is improved by using differential GPS. As described by Rudow, a course communications network is established via transceivers between a course base station 10 and carts 15 for transmission of advertising, general information, system-wide and individual cart messages from the base station. (See col. 7, lines 35-40.) Rudow, however, indicates that DGPS corrections, and transmission of messages are performed from the carts to the base station.

According to the Examiner, a radio frequency processing means for receiving digital broadcasting signals including multiplexed multimedia data and DGPS data and converting the receiver broadcasting signal into base band data, is disclosed in col. 7, lines 30-44 and col. 18, lines 35-67 of Rudow. Regarding col. 7, lines 30-44 of Rudow this passage refers to the course

communications network, which is used to communicate transmission of messages as well as DGPS corrections between the carts and the base station. Regarding col. 18, lines 35-67, this passage refers to a variable length packet network that is used for communications of digital messages (containing data packets) between the base station and the roving units in a half tube duplex Time Division Multiplex digital communication system. (See col. 18, lines 39-43.) Rudow, however, does not describe converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 through the DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver.

In contrast with Claim 1, Rudow discloses that differential GPS corrections are provided in the RTCM-104 format to the base station, where they are repackaged into subpackets constituting an improved form for RF transmission. As described by Rudow the base station places subpackets in a DGPS packet for broadcast to the roving units. (See col. 20, lines 39-50.) Hence, rather than convert GPS information into RTCM104 data, which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, Rudow converts such differential GPS corrections into a form that is more robust for RF transmission, where the roving unit is responsible for RTCM-104 format message reconstruction for transfer to a GPS receiver card. (See col. 21, line 63-col. 22, line 3.) In view of such passage above, rather than converting differential corrections into RTCM104 data, Rudow explicitly requires that the base station convert such differential GPS corrections into a format that is more robust for RF transmission. Consequently, Rudow explicitly requires that the roving unit (golf cart) is responsible for reformatting of received DGPS packets into an RTCM104 format.

Regarding Tiwari, Tiwari discloses a differential GPS using a radio data system. In contrast with Claim 1, Tiwari describes a method for receiving information from a plurality of GPS satellites and for rebroadcasting a selected portion of this information for receipt by selected recipients (see col. 1, lines 6-9). In contrast with Claim 1, Tiwari fails to disclose digital broadcast signals including encoded multimedia data and encoded DGPS data, much less decoding means to generate decoded data including decoded multimedia data and decoded DGPS data. According to the Examiner, these features of Claim 1 are disclosed at col. 6, lines 36-40 of Tiwari.

However, the passage referred to by the Examiner describes an FM broadcast receiver 60, as shown in Fig. 1 of Tiwari. In contrast with Claim 1, receiver 60 does not receive broadcast signals including encoded multimedia data and encoded DGPS data, as in Claim 1. As disclosed by Tiwari, receiver 60 receives rebroadcast selected GPS signals from FM radio station 50. As disclosed by Tiwari, preprocessor 30 reformats RTCM DGPS data to comply with an RDS system message format and prioritizes the messages to receive the best possible accuracy at the available data rate. Hence, receiver 60 merely receives reformatted RTCM DGPS data according to a radio data system (RDS) message format (see col. 6, lines 1-7).

Furthermore, neither col. 6, lines 37-40, nor any other portion of Tiwari, discloses or suggests converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 data through a DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver, as in Claim 1. In other words, reformatted RTCM DGPS data, according to an RDS system message format of Tiwari does not disclose or suggest converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 data through the DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver of Claim 1.

Similar to Rudow, Tiwari does not teach or suggest each of the features of Claim 1, which is amended to recite converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 data through the DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver.

Hence, the Examiner has failed to identify and we are unable to discern any other portion of Rudow or Tiwari that teach or suggest the radio frequency processing means of Claim 1, which receives digital broadcasting signals, including multiplexed multimedia data and DGPS data, much less converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 data through the DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver, as in Claim 1. No combination of Rudow in view of Tiwari can teach or suggest the formatting means of Claim 1, which converting the DGPS information into RTCM104 data which is compatible with a DGPS

RTCM data input port of a separate GPS receiver, and outputting the RTCM104 data through the DGPS RTCM data output port to the separate GPS receiver, as in Claim 1.

For each of the above reasons, therefore, Claim 1 and all claims which depend from Claim 1 are patentable over the cited art. Each of Applicant's other independent claims, including Claim 3, recite features similar to those highlighted above with regard to Claim 1. Therefore, each of Applicant's other independent claims, including Claim 3, and all claims which depend from them, are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicant's silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, as amended, patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Per 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) and in connection with the Office Action mailed on FEBRUARY 2, 2008, Applicant respectfully petitions Commissioner for a one (1) month extension of time, extending the period for response to JUNE 2, 2008. The amount of \$65.00 to cover the petition filing fee for a 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(1) small entity will be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 1, 2009

By: 

Joseph Lutz, Reg. No. 43,765

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on June 1, 2009.


Si Vuong